

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
AMARILLO DIVISION

DANIEL BARNETT,

Plaintiff/Counter-Defendant,

v.

2:24-CV-230-Z-BR

REFINISHING SYSTEMS and
MATTHEW C. ARMSTRONG,

Defendants/Counter-Claimants.

ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATION

Before the Court are the Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation (“FCR”) of the United States Magistrate Judge to grant Plaintiff Daniel Barnett’s Motion to Remand. ECF No. 23. No objections to the FCR have been filed.

After making an independent review of the pleadings, files, and records in this case, the Court concludes that the FCR of the Magistrate Judge is correct. *See* ECF No. 23 at 9 (“Plaintiff’s well-pleaded complaint does not implicate Grable Because a federal issue only appears within Defendants’ counterclaims, removal jurisdiction is not proper.”). It is therefore **ORDERED** that the FCR of the Magistrate Judge (ECF No. 23) is **ADOPTED** and Plaintiff Daniel Barnett’s Motion to Remand (ECF No. 8) is **GRANTED**.

SO ORDERED.

June 3, 2025



MATTHEW J. KACSMARYK
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE